

Amendments to the Drawings

Please amend the drawings as indicated in the attached substitute drawings, specifically amending Figs. 2 and 5-6.

REMARKS

Claims 1-58 have been cancelled. Claims 59-122 have been added, including the recitation of some of the previously pending elements of claims 1-58 and additional elements to further define the features of the invention. Accordingly, claims 59-122 are the claims of record of the present application. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit the claims are in condition for allowance.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION AND FIGURES

In paragraphs 6-8 of the Office Action, drawings were objected to based on 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(4), and other noted assertions. To overcome these objections, Applicants herein submit amendments to the specification, as noted above. In addition, Applicants submit amendment Drawings to overcome the any noted objections and conform with the specification. Therefore, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. To overcome this objection, claim 76 has been added. Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request the objection be withdrawn.

ADDED CLAIMS

New claim 59 has been amended to improve clarity and more clearly define the invention of the claims, as compared with previously pending claim 1. The addition of new claims are not made for reasons of patentability or because of any issue brought up by the Examiner. Additionally, claims previously cancelled by the Examiner have been added, including dependency from independent claim 59, thereby obviating an restriction/election requirement.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1

In paragraph 12 of the Office Action, previously pending claim 57 was rejected under 35 USC 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement in that the claim claims subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. To further clarify the definition of the claim, added claim 120 incorporates the detection/notification elements of claim 91. Furthermore, the broad functionality of the claim is disclosed in the specification at page 14 lines 29 to 31, where it is stated that "the functionality of the gateway is incorporated directly

into the camera and a telecommunications interface 57 is provided for direct connection with the communications server.” Implementation of the functionality beyond this statement is considered to be within the capabilities of the skilled addressee.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(A)

In paragraph 17(a) of the Office Action, independent claim 1 is rejected under U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by European Patent No. 0 838 768 A2 to Venkatraman et al. (hereafter referred to as “Venkatraman”). In view of the cancellation of claim 1, Applicants direct remarks to added claim 59.

To reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), the Office must demonstrate that each and every claim feature is identically disclosed in a single prior art reference. See *Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Comments regarding the invention of Venkatramen submitted in the previous response are reiterated, and have been included hereafter for convenience:

Independent claim 59 of Applicant’s invention recites a system for monitoring a environment comprising an Internet browser connectable to an extranet, an extranet located external to said environment and accessible via said Internet browser, a communications server located in said extranet and adapted to interconnect on demand with one of a series of connection gateways located in predetermined environments and a connection gateway located in said environment to serve a user interface for the control or monitoring of the operation of at least one service in said environment, wherein upon accessing a predetermined address by said Internet browser on said extranet, said communications server creates a new connection to a predetermined one of said connection gateways to control or monitor the operation of said service, with said connection gateway subsequently serving pages directly to said Internet browser displaying the state of operation of said service.

Venkatraman purportedly relates to embedding a web server in a device to serve as a HTML user interface for the device in which it is embedded. In Venkatraman, however, it is assumed that the gateway for serving the HTML interface is already connected to the Internet. In contrast to Venkatraman, Applicant’s invention requires a communications

server to create a new connection to a connection gateway for controlling or monitoring the operation of the services.

Moreover, Venkatraman discloses a user interface for a device wherein the claimed invention relates to a user interface for a service, in which the service may monitor or control one or more devices on a plurality of networks. It is noted that this service need not expose actual controls or outputs of a particular device, but may aggregate the state of one or more devices before providing status information to the user.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the evidence relied upon by the Examiner to support the objection with respect to Venkatramen is incorrect. Specifically, with respect to the elements of claim 59 as presently amended:

*59. (Presently Amended) A system for monitoring a environment comprising:
an Internet browser connectable to an extranet;*

The Examiner indicates that Venkatraman anticipates this element in lines 24 to 29 of page 2. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. The referenced lines of Venkatramen refer to an external PC connected to a device and running a web server, not an Internet browser which cannot operate as a web server.

an extranet located external to said environment and accessible via said Internet browser;

The Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates this element in lines 37 of page 4 through line 1 of page 5. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. The referenced lines of Venkatramen refer to a home based network, a device with an embedded web server and device web page, where user accesses device specific user interface for device by entering the URL for the device web page embedded in the device – this is not an extranet external to said environment as would be recognised by the skilled addressee.

a communications server located in said extranet and adapted to interconnect on demand with one of a series of connection gateways located in predetermined environments; and

The Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates this element in lines 38 to 43 of page 2, lines 24 to 40 of page 4, and item 30 in figure 2. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. Lines 38 to 43 of page 2 describe a device with embedded a network interface providing web access, a web server, and a device web page, so that the device web page may be accessed by a web browser. There is no correspondence between this and the

above element of the claim. Lines 24 to 40 of page 4 refer to a device that is a controller module in an automobile where a cellular transceiver enables a web browser to access the device web page. However, this simply describes one form of a network interface, and there is no correspondence between this and the on-demand connection capability required by the claim element, where Internet browser connected to Internet, upon accessing a URL on an extranet that is external to the environment, invokes a communication server located in extranet to interconnect with connection gateway in environment.

a connection gateway located in said environment to serve a user interface for the control or monitoring of the operation of at least one service in said environment;

The Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates this element in lines 15 to 18 of page 4 and lines 30 to 33 of page 4 and lines 37 to 40 of page 4. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. The referenced lines all refer to a device web page served by the device the user seeks to interact with. The above claim element refers instead to a connection gateway that serves a user interface for a service (that interacts with and monitors and controls devices connected to the connection gateway). This differs inherently from Venkatraman. Note that, even though the connection gateway serves a user interface for a service that monitors and/or controls separate devices that do not contain embedded device web pages, the connection gateway as defined in the claim is a device, and provides a device web page, which differs intrinsically from Venkatraman.

wherein upon accessing a predetermined address by said Internet browser on said extranet, said communications server subsequently creates a new connection to a predetermined one of said connection gateways to control or monitor the operation of said service, with said connection gateway, with said connection gateway subsequently providing access to information contained within the environment directly to said Internet browser.

The Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates this element in lines 14 to 22 of page 3 and lines 6 to 12 of page 5. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. The claimed element describes the on-demand connection mechanism to an unconnected environment when accessing through a web browser an address on the extranet. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no evidence in the referenced lines of Venkatraman that the skilled addressee would associate with the functionality of the claimed element.

As previously submitted, one of the main benefits associated with the Applicant's invention is that it substantially enhances the remote monitoring capabilities of the user since the user can flexibly access a web site on an extranet and thereby establish a connection to a gateway

associated with the monitored and/or controlled environment. It is submitted that these benefits are not provided by the techniques disclosed by Venkatraman.

For at least the foregoing reasons it is submitted that Venkatraman does not anticipate the features of claim 59.

In paragraphs 17(b) to 17(j) of the Office Action, previously pending claims 2 to 3, 6, 10 to 11, 14, 26, 31, 46 to 55 and 57 are rejected under U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by European Patent No. 0 838 768 A2 to Venkatraman et al. In view of the cancellation of these claims, Applicants submit the following with respect to added claims 63-64, 67, 71-72, 75, 87, 88, 109-118 and 120.

In paragraph 17 (b) of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates the features of previously pending claim 2, (similar to current pending claim 63) in lines 8 to 9 of page 2 and lines 37 to 40 of page 6. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. Lines 8 to 9 of page 2 are simply references to devices - a security system, appliances, thermostat. Lines 37 to 40 of page 6 reference device interrogation and control for sets of devices, where each device has an embedded device web page. The monitoring device referred to in the claim as presented does not include an embedded device webpage.

In paragraph 17 (c) of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates the features of previously pending claim 3, (similar to current pending claim 64), in lines 44 to 45 of page 3. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. There is no reference in Venkatraman to an external communication server that creates a connection on-demand with a connection gateway.

In paragraph 17 (d) of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates the features of previously pending claim 6, (similar to current pending claim 67), in lines 52 to 55 of page 2 and lines 28 to 36 of page 3. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. Lines 28 to 36 of page 3 refer to a web server embedded within the device which generates the web page, not interface pages that are stored external to the device on the extranet. The interface pages referred to in the claim as presented does are not generated from an embedded device web server.

In paragraph 17 (e) of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates the features of previously pending claims 8 and 53, (similar to current pending claims 69 and 116) in lines 37 of page 3 through line 1 of page 4 and lines 45 to 55 of page 4. Applicants

respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. Lines 37 of page 3 through line 1 of page 4 relate to a device with embedded web server and device web page. They do not discuss the device that runs the web browser. Lines 49 to 55 of page 4 do discuss the web browser being embodied in a computer system and any platform that provides HTTP client functions and renders HTML files. However, there is no suggestion of the capability for on-demand interconnection with a connection gateway as required by claim 59, upon which the present claim is dependent.

In paragraph 17 (f) of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates the features of previously pending claim 11, (similar to current pending claim 72), in lines 5 to 11 of page 2. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. Lines 5-11 of page 2 are simply references to devices that require user interface functions, including a fax machine. However, the present claim 72 refers to specific method whereby the connection gateway receives a fax through its telecommunication interface and stores the fax (locally, in memory). There is no correlation between the features of the claim and the referenced section.

In paragraph 17 (g) of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates the features of previously pending claim 14, (similar to current pending claim 75), in lines 5 to 11 of page 2. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. Lines 5 to 11 of page 2 are simply references to devices that require user interface functions. This claim is directed at explicitly covering the case where the functions of the connection gateway are embodied in a home gateway/router/hub arrangement.

In paragraph 17 (h) of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates the features of previously pending claim 26, (similar to current pending claim 87), on page 4. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect and that page 4 of Venkatramen makes no reference to an external access control mechanism.

In paragraph 17 (i) of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates the features of previously pending claims 46-53, (similar to current pending claims 109-116), on page 2. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect and that page 2 of Venkatramen simply references different examples of devices that require user interface function and how devices can embed web server, device web page and network interface to provide a device user interface accessible through web browser. The claims above define the

preferred embodiments of services and environments within the invention as defined in claim 59.

In paragraph 17 (j) of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Venkatraman anticipates the features of previously pending claims 54 and 57, (similar to current pending claims 117 and 120), in lines 27 to 53 of page 3. Applicants respectfully submit that this assertion is incorrect. The claims refer to a service monitoring or controlling devices that do not have an embedded device web page/web server/network interface as described by Venkatramen.

In the light of the claims as presently amended and the forgoing discussion, it is respectfully submitted that all claims 59-122 are patentable in view of Venkatramen and the rejection of the claims be reversed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the application.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A)

In the previous final Office Action, previously pending claims were also rejected as being unpatentable over Venkatramen in view of a variety of prior art references and Examiner's official notice. In view of the cancellation of pending claims 1-58 and the addition of claims 59-122 and in view of the above-offered position regarding the teaching of Venkatramen with respect to Independent claim 59, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims 59-122 as presented are in condition for allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: April 19, 2006

By: 

Timothy J. Bechen
Reg. No. 48,126

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646